

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

With this amendment, claims 1 – 4, 6, 7, 10 – 12, 14 – 25, 27 - 33 are in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Patentability of the Claims

For the Examiner's information, with this amendment, claim 1 has been combined with now cancelled claim 13 as well as a portion of the subject matter of the prior version of claim 14.

Claims 24, 25 and 30 have also been combined with the subject matter of now cancelled claim 13 as well as a portion of the subject matter of the prior version of claim 14.

A further feature added to the above claims is recited as "...said secure area including regions requiring different access authority...." Support for this further limitation may be found at paragraph 50 and to a lesser degree paragraph 69 of the present application.

Thus, the amendments include the addition of multiple regions within the secure area, with the regions requiring different authorization from each other. By example, this recognizes the possibility of personnel having access to portions of the secure area, with hierarchical security clearance for restricted areas.

With reference to Carroll (US 4,952,928), the disclosure is directed specifically to the control of prisoners under house arrest. Thus, personnel to which the invention of Carroll is intended are either within the secure area, or not. There is no disclosure of the secure area having varying levels of security. Further, there is nothing within Carroll that would lead the skilled reader into considering such a division of the secure area.

The prior office action asserts:

"...the security status of a person fitted with the transponder of Carroll would be implied, because the transponder is only used to track individuals who are currently under house arrest...."

As submitted, Carroll does not imply a varying degree of security status within the same secure area. Whilst the Examiner argues that the person may visit different locations, he must

travel outside the secure area in order to do so. The parole officer's office does not lie within the home of the person, and so is not a region "within the secure area."

As Belcher does not discuss this division of the secure area by varying security authorization, applicant submits that Claims 1, 20, 21 and 26 and the claims depending therefrom are neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicant believes that all of the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, and an early notification to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact applicant's attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
ipsolon llp
/pwh #31,169/
Patrick W. Hughey
Registration No. 31,169
Tel. No. (503) 274-5455